

REMARKS

The Office Action of January 17, 2007 has been received and its contents carefully considered.

The present Amendment revises claims 1, 3-6, 8, 10, 12-15 and 17, and cancels claims 2, 11, 19, and 20.

The present Amendment also forwards a replacement drawing sheet for Figure 5. It corrects the informality noted in section 1 of the Office Action, so the drawing objection should now be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C 102(b) as being anticipated by published US application 2001/0020254 by Blumenau et al (which will be called simply "Blumenau" hereafter for the sake of convenient discussion). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

With regard to independent claims 1 and 10, it is respectfully submitted that Blumenau does not really teach or suggest what the Office Action relies upon the reference as supposedly teaching. Blumenau fails to disclose, suggest, or teach, inter alia, the following features recited in claim 1 (with emphasis added):

"a plurality of ports, wherein each port has respective authority for transmission therefrom to at least one of the ports;"

"an object access interface to receive an access request from at least one entity corresponding to at least one of the ports, wherein the access request includes at least an identification of the entity that issue the access request, a source port, a destination port, object information and access content comprising a write command;"

"a resource management module to assign a command handler to the access request;"

"an access management module to determine authority of the access request according to the identification and the source port to determine whether the entity that issued the access request has the authority of transmission with the destination port;"

"an object management module to write an object corresponding to the object information to the destination port according to the write command in the access content if the entity that issued the access request has the authority," and

"the command handler is released after the object is written to the destination port."

In the Blumenau reference, a plurality of ports are disclosed; however, no transmission limitations therebetween are discussed. In Applicant's arrangement, the object management system comprises a plurality of ports, and each port has respective authority for transmission therefrom to at least one of the ports. Additionally, each entity has at least one of the ports for transmitting and receiving data therefrom. Nowhere in the Blumenau reference does it discuss the transmission authority between ports.

In the Blumenau reference (abstract and paragraphs 0010-0011 and 0182), the request may be a non-media access request or media access request. It is determined whether a device is authorized to have non-media access to a specific logic volume of data, and if so, the non-media access request from the device is authorized. In Applicant's arrangement, the access request includes at least an identification of the entity, a source port, a destination port, object information, and access content comprising a write command. It is determined whether the entity has the authority of transmission with the destination port according to the identification and the source port. The authorities in Applicant's arrangement and the Blumenau reference are different. Additionally, each port in Applicant's arrangement has respective authority for transmission therefrom to at least one of the other ports. Authority is determined according to the identification and the source port. Nowhere does the Blumenau reference disclose that authority is determined according to port, as in Applicant's arrangement.

In the Blumenau reference (paragraphs 0136-0137 and 0167), a plurality of storage volume icons are provided to indicate the status of a storage device. In Applicant's arrangement, the object management system comprises limited command handlers. If a request is received, one of the command handlers is assigned to the request for handling the subsequent access procedure of the request. After the procedure of the request finishes, the assigned command handler is released. In Applicant's arrangement, the command handlers are similar to the tasks in an OS (Operating System) of computer science. A system may have several tasks running simultaneously. The number of the command handlers depends on the resources of the system.

The command handler is totally different than what is disclosed in the Blumenau reference.

Further, the objective of the Blumenau reference is to manage access to a storage system, and the Blumenau reference does not suggest or teach the feature of data transmission between ports writing object to the destination port) of the invention.

Similar comments apply with respect to independent claim 10. Since Blumenau fails to teach the claimed features above of the invention, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 10 are patentable over the cited reference. Insofar as claims 3-9 directly or indirectly depend from claim 1, and claims 12-18 directly or indirectly depend from claim 10, they are also patentable.

In view of the foregoing remarks, reconsideration of the application and the timely allowance of claims are respectfully requested..

Respectfully submitted,



Allen Wood
(Registration No. 28,134)
Rabin & Berdo, P.C.
Customer number 23995
Rabin & Berdo, P.C.
Telephone: (202) 326-0222
Facsimile: (202) 408-0924